

REMARKS

The Notice mailed June 13, 2006 asserts that the Response submitted on March 15, 2006 is “not fully responsive” because claims 77 and 80-83 “do not include discussion.” This is interpreted to be an assertion that the Response does not include arguments as to how claims 77 and 80-83 overcome the applied rejections. Since such arguments were included in the Response, the Notice is respectfully traversed.

Generally, the entire Response discusses claims 65-73 in parallel with claims 74-83, respectively, which are intended to be improved substitutes for claims 65-73. The second sentence of the response explains that claims 74-83 are re-written versions of claims 65-73. Thus, it should be clear that remarks made with respect to claim 65, for example, are intended to apply to corresponding claim 74.

Moreover, the Response explicitly discusses claims 77 and 80-83, as detailed below.

Page 10, lines 11-14 of the Response explains why claim 77 overcomes the rejections to predecessor claim 68.

Page 11, lines 11-16 of the Response explains why claims 80 and 83 overcome the rejection of predecessor claim 71.

Page 11, lines 17-20 of the Response explains why claim 81 overcomes the rejection of predecessor claim 72.

Page 12, lines 1-3 of the Response explains why claim 73 should not have been rejected, and claim 73 is identical to claim 82.

Thus, the Response *did* include discussion of claims 77 and 80-83.


Nevertheless, in order to avoid further delay in prosecution of this application, Applicant states as follows: (1) remarks made regarding claim 68 should be interpreted as applying to claim 77; (2) remarks made regarding claim 71 should be interpreted as applying to claims 80 and 83; (3) remarks regarding claim 72 should be interpreted as applying to claim 81; and (4) remarks regarding claim 73 should be interpreted as applying to claim 82, as appropriate.

If the Examiner has additional questions or remarks concerning the above, he is encouraged to telephone Applicant's representative at the number provided below.

No fees are believed due with this Response. However, if any fees are due, please charge such fee to Deposit Account 50-0310.

Dated: June 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Steven D. Underwood

Reg. No. 47,205

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Customer No. 009629

212-309-6196